



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,017	02/14/2001	Hiroshi Kamiya	Q63036	3808
23373 7590 06/22/2010 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			EXAMINER THEIN, MARIA TERESA T	
			ART UNIT 3627	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 06/22/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com
PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM
USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
2
3

4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
5 AND INTERFERENCES
6

7 *Ex parte* HIROSHI KAMIYA
8
9

10 Appeal 2009-010971
11 Application 09/782,017
12 Technology Center 3600
13
14

15
16 Decided: June 18, 2010
17
18

19 Before MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD, HUBERT C. LORIN, and ANTON W.
20 FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

21 FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

22 DECISION ON APPEAL
23

1 STATEMENT OF THE CASE

2 Hiroshi Kamiya (Appellant) seeks review under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002)
3 of a final rejection of claims 1-47, the only claims pending in the application
4 on appeal.

5 We have jurisdiction over the appeal pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 6(b)
6 (2002).

7 SUMMARY OF DECISION¹

8 We AFFIRM.

9 THE INVENTION

10 The Appellant invented a commodity ordering issuing and accepting
11 method, a system thereof, and a commodity order accepting apparatus to
12 those using the Internet (Specification 1:6-8).

13 An understanding of the invention can be derived from a reading of
14 exemplary claims 1, 2, and 43, which are reproduced below [bracketed
15 matter and some paragraphing added].

16 1. A commodity order issuing and accepting method,
17 comprising:

18 [1] providing an order issuing device capable of electronic
19 communications;

¹ Our decision will make reference to the Appellant's Appeal Brief ("App. Br.," filed September 15, 2008) and Reply Brief ("Reply Br.," filed February 10, 2009), and the Examiner's Answer ("Ans.," mailed December 10, 2008), and Final Rejection ("Final Rej.," mailed January 8, 2008).

[2] providing an order accepting device capable of electronic communications;

[3] requesting a first electronic document comprising first input fields for accepting order issuer information and for accepting commodity order issuance information except for an order issuer's payment date from said order accepting device;

[4] transmitting said first electronic document to said order issuing device;

[5] inputting said order issuer information and said commodity order issuance information except for said order issuer's payment date into said first input fields on said order issuing device;

[6] transmitting said order issuer information and said commodity order issuance information except for said order issuer's payment date to said order accepting device;

[7] retrieving a transaction condition corresponding to said commodity order issuance information on said order accepting device;

[8] transmitting a second electronic document on which said transaction condition is described and which has a second input field for said order issuer's payment date to said order issuing device;

[9] inputting said order issuer's payment date into said second input field on said order issuing device; and

[10] transmitting said order issuer's payment date to said order accepting device, wherein said second electronic document comprises a formula for calculating a payment price based on said order issuer's payment date.

2. The commodity order issuing and accepting method as set forth in claim 1, further comprising:

calculating a reduced price corresponding to said transaction condition and said order issuer's payment date on said order accepting device.

43. The commodity order issuing and accepting method of claim 1, wherein the second electronic document comprises fields displaying a regular payment amount and a payment due date, the regular payment amount being due on the payment due date, and wherein the payment amount and the payment due date are determined by the order accepting device.

THE REJECTIONS

The Examiner relies upon the following prior art:

Benton et al.	US 4,926,325	May 15, 1990
O'Hagan et al.	US 6,314,406 B1	Nov. 6, 2001
Walker et al.	US 6,405,174 B1	Jun. 11, 2002
Murcko, Jr.	US 6,578,014 B1	Jun. 10, 2003

Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, and 13-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murcko and Benton.

Claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murcko, Benton, and O'Hagan.

Claims 43-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murcko, Benton, and Walker.

ISSUES

The issue of whether the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1, 4, 7, 10, and 13-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Murcko and Benton turns on whether Murcko describes a second electronic document

1 that comprises a formula for calculating a payment price based on said order
2 issuer's payment date.

3 The issue of whether the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-
4 9, and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Murcko,
5 Benton, and O'Hagan turns on whether O'Hagan describes calculating a
6 reduced price, as required by claims 2 and 5.

7 The issue of whether the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 43-47 under
8 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Murcko, Benton, and Walker turns
9 on whether the Appellant's arguments in support of the independent claims
10 is found persuasive.

11
12 **FACTS PERTINENT TO THE ISSUES**

13 The following enumerated Findings of Fact (FF) are believed to be
14 supported by a preponderance of the evidence.

15 *Facts Related to the Prior Art*

16 *Murcko*

17 01. Murcko is directed to a method and apparatus to facilitate
18 network transactions (Murcko 1:18-20).

19 02. Murcko describes a system that enables communication
20 between buyers and sellers (Murcko 4:5-7). A seller specifies the
21 item to be sold and searches for buyers (Murcko 4:8-14). The
22 seller then provides the item or a description of the item to the
23 buyer (Murcko 4:16-19). The system assigns a unique tracking ID
24 to the item and is sent to each buyer (Murcko 4:23-25). The buyer

1 then views the item sent and specifies payment amounts to the
2 seller or requests additional information (Murcko 4:25-29). After
3 the buyer submits payments to the system, the system sends the
4 payment to the seller (Murcko 4:29-31).

5 03. Buyers can also submit a Buyer Item Request form that allows
6 buyers to specify items they would like to buy, which sellers they
7 are interested in buying from, and other information (Murcko
8 27:20-31). Buyers can also specify or provide guidance about
9 what payment amount they will be willing to pay for the desired
10 item (Murcko 27:64-67). A buyer can further specify a cutoff
11 percentile for sellers providing items or specify a cutoff percentile
12 for each item requested (Murcko 28:1-6). A buyer would indicate
13 a cutoff percentile for sellers in order to specify which sellers will
14 accept the buyer paying an average payment of a certain amount
15 (Murcko 28:7-13). All payments will be assigned a payment date
16 and buyers will have to pay an additional fee for late payments
17 (Murcko 28:61-65).

18 *Benton*

19 04. Benton is directed to a unique electronic funds transfer system
20 incorporating facsimile machines both to transfer funds data
21 between buyers and sellers at a common point of sale or at remote
22 locations and to print transaction records including facsimile
23 signatures of the parties (Benton 1:13-19).

O'Hagan

05. O'Hagan is directed to a system for optically extracting indicia from a coupon and employing the extracted indicia within the network to facilitate customer shopping, manufacturer marketing, and store efficiency (O'Hagan 1:14-19).

06. O'Hagan specifically describes a system that allows a customer to scan coupons at home such that the customer maintains an electronic list of coupons (O'Hagan 3:13-20). The customer further can create a shopping list to compliment the coupon list and go to the store at a time of convenience (O'Hagan 3:20-24). At the store, the customer uses a shopping cart equipped with a portable device to assist the customer to shop efficiently and to scan items as the customer places the items into the shopping cart (O'Hagan 3:25-42).

07. In order to add an item on to a shopping list, a user enters or scans the barcode information (O'Hagan 20:60-62). The system retrieves product data and returns a confirmation page that includes product information such as product price, product availability, coupons, discounts, terms on coupons/discounts, etc. (O'Hagan 21:11-16). After the user selects whether to add the item, the home terminal connects to a merchant's computer, transmits new coupon list information, and updates the product information on the confirmation page, including product price, product availability, coupons, discounts, terms on coupons/discounts etc. (O'Hagan 21:40-57). The customer

shopping list includes information as to how long the price quote will remain in effect, the time of purchase of the product, and the price paid by the customer (O'Hagan 23:41-57). The customer pays the lower of the price of the product being offered at the store or the price quoted previously using the system (O'Hagan 28:44-50).

Walker

08. Walker is directed to a method and apparatus for providing discounts (Walker 1:31-32).

ANALYSIS

Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, and 13-42 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murcko and Benton

The Appellant first contends that (1) Murcko, Benton, O'Hagan, and Walker fails to describe "wherein said second electronic document comprises a formula for calculating a payment price based on said order issuer's payment date" as required by limitation [10] of claim 1 (App. Br. 16-19). The Appellant specifically argues that Murcko describes the buyer provides the payment amount they might be willing to pay, rather than a formula as claimed (App. Br. 17-18). We disagree with the Appellant. First, we note that limitation [10] only requires that the formula is based on the issuer's payment date. There are no other limitations required of the formula. As such, limitation [10] only requires any adjustment to the payment price that is based on the issuer's payment date.

1 Murcko describes a system that facilitates communication between
2 buyers and sellers, where a buyer can describe the item and the price the
3 buyer is willing to pay (FF 01-02). Murcko further describes that a buyer
4 can specify a cutoff percentile for each requested item (FF 03). A buyer can
5 also specify a cutoff percentile for sellers, where the cutoff condition is for
6 sellers that will accept an average payment amount (FF 03). Payment is also
7 required on a specific date and if payment is not timely received additional
8 fees are assessed (FF 03). That is, the amount due is adjusted based on a
9 formula to account for payments that are not received on the payment date
10 and the amount due is increased by the late fee amount.

11 The Appellant further argues that the late fee, as described by Murcko, is
12 merely a fee added to the set payment amount (Reply Br. 5). Although a late
13 fee is a fee added to the payment amount, the Appellant has failed to provide
14 any rationale that distinguishes how Murcko's description of a formulaic
15 adjustment of the payment amount based on the payment date is
16 distinguished from the claimed invention. As such, the Appellant's
17 argument is not found persuasive. Therefore, Murcko describes more than
18 just allowing a buyer to dictate how much they are willing to pay; Murcko
19 describes that payment options are provided such that the buyer can submit a
20 formula that cutoffs off potential sellers and further describes formula to
21 adjust the amount due if payment is not received by the payment date.

22 The Appellant also argues that Benton, O'Hagan and Walker fail to
23 describe limitation [10] of claim 1 (App Br. 19). However, the Examiner
24 has relied on Murcko to describe this feature. As such, the Appellant's
25 contention does not persuade us of error on the part of the Examiner because
26 the Appellant responds to the rejection by attacking the references

separately, even though the rejection is based on the combined teachings of the references. Nonobviousness cannot be established by attacking the references individually when the rejection is predicated upon a combination of prior art disclosures. *See In re Merck & Co. Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 1097 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The Examiner did not err in rejecting claims 1, 4, 7, 10, and 13-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Murcko and Benton.

Claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, and 11-12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murcko, Benton, and O'Hagan

The Appellant contends that O'Hagan fails to describe "calculating a reduced price corresponding to...said order issuer's payment date on said order accepting device" as required by claims 2 and 5 (App. Br. 20). We disagree with the Appellant. In rejecting claims 2 and 5, the Examiner relied on O'Hagan to describe this feature (Ans. 7-8). O'Hagan describes an electronic shipping system that allows a user to scan coupons at home, create a shopping list, and shop at the store at the user's convenience (FF 06-07). O'Hagan describes that when a user selects an item to be placed in the shopping list, the system displays a confirmation that includes product information (FF 07). The product information includes product price, product availability, coupons, discounts, terms on coupons/discounts, etc. (FF 07). Once a user selects a product to be added to the shopping list, the user's terminal connects to a merchant's computer and updates the product information (FF 07). That is, the user's shopping cart displays and calculates discounted prices based on coupons and discounts. The system

1 further incorporates the terms and conditions of the coupons and discounts,
2 such as their time of expiration (FF 07). The Appellant agrees that O'Hagan
3 describes the confirmation page, but fails to set forth any rationale to
4 distinguish the claimed invention from O'Hagan. As such, we find that
5 O'Hagan describes this limitation of claims 2 and 5.

6 The Appellant further contends that Murcko and Benton fail to describe
7 this limitation. However, the Examiner relied on O'Hagan in the rejection
8 of these claims. As such, the Appellant's contention does not persuade us of
9 error on the part of the Examiner because the Appellant responds to the
10 rejection by attacking the references separately, even though the rejection is
11 based on the combined teachings of the references. Nonobviousness cannot
12 be established by attacking the references individually when the rejection is
13 predicated upon a combination of prior art disclosures. *Id.*

14 The Examiner did not err in rejecting claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, and 11-12
15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Murcko, Benton, and
16 O'Hagan.

17 *Claims 43-47 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable*
18 *over Murcko, Benton, and Walker*

19 The Appellant contends that claims 43-47 depend from the independent
20 claims and are allowable for the same reasons provided in support of those
21 claims *supra* (App. Br. 20). We disagree with the Appellant. The
22 Appellant's arguments were not found persuasive *supra* and are not found
23 persuasive here for the same reasons. As such, the Examiner did not err in
24 rejecting claims 43-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over
25 Murcko, Benton, and Walker.

1

2

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

3

4

The Examiner did not err in rejecting claims 1, 4, 7, 10, and 13-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Murcko and Benton.

5

6

The Examiner did not err in rejecting claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Murcko, Benton, and O'Hagan.

8

9

The Examiner did not err in rejecting claims 43-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Murcko, Benton, and Walker.

10

11

DECISION

12

To summarize, our decision is as follows:

13

14

- The rejection of claims 1, 4, 7, 10, and 13-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Murcko and Benton is sustained.

15

16

17

- The rejection of claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Murcko, Benton, and O'Hagan is sustained.

18

19

- The rejection of claims 43-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Murcko, Benton, and Walker is sustained.

20

21

22

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

1

2

AFFIRMED

3

4

5

6 mev

7

8 Address

9 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

10 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.

11 SUITE 800

12 WASHINGTON DC 20037